

1 **EXHIBIT E**

2 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
3 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

4 **Drew J. Ribar,**
5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 **State of Nevada ex rel. Nevada Department of Corrections, Carson City, et al.,**
8 Defendants.

9 **Case No. 3:24-cv-00103-ART-CLB**

10
11 **EXHIBIT E – Deputy Sean Palamar Towing Discussion Footage**

12
13 **Filed in Support of Amended Complaint and Summary Judgment Motion (Fed. R. Civ. P.**

14 **56)**

15 Plaintiff Drew J. Ribar, pro se, submits Exhibit E, video footage of Deputy Sean Palamar
16 ordering the non-consensual tow of Plaintiff's truck and discussing it with a tow truck driver on
17 August 30, 2022, obtained via discovery in Case No. 22 CR 01231 1C (dismissed). Filed on USB
18 per LR IC 2-2 with a Notice of Manual Filing, this exhibit supports Plaintiff's claims and Rule
19 56 motion.

20
21
22
23
24 **Key Evidence and Legal Violations**

25
26
27
28 PLEADING TITLE - 1

Legal Claims Supported

- **First Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983):** Retaliation for recording by targeting Plaintiff's towing rotation status (*Fordyce, Umbehr, Glik v. Cunniffe*, 655 F.3d 78 (1st Cir. 2011); *Irizarry v. Yehia*, 38 F.4th 1282 (10th Cir. 2022); *Nieves*; NRS 171.1233).

- 1 • **Fourth Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983):** Unlawful seizure of truck without warrant or
2 exigency (*Soldal*).
- 3 • **Fourteenth Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 1983):** Procedural due process violation via tow
4 and threats without notice (*Mathews, Parratt*); substantive due process via economic
5 harm (*Meyer, County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833, 1998).
- 6 • **Municipal Liability (42 U.S.C. § 1983):** Sheriff's policy/custom of retaliation implied
7 by "my bosses" (0:01:20; *Monell*).
- 8 • **State Law Claims:** Unlawful taking or operation (NRS 205.2715), oppression under
9 color of law (NRS 197.200), intentional interference with prospective economic
10 advantage, defamation/trade libel (28 U.S.C. § 1367).

15 **Summary Judgment Purpose (Fed. R. Civ. P. 56)**

16
17 These undisputed facts—non-consensual tow (Exhibit D, 0:06:32.625), license revocation threat
18 (0:01:04), rotation termination threat (0:01:20)—violate clearly established law (*Fordyce, Soldal,*
19 *Mathews*). Linked to Plaintiff's recording (Exhibit C, 0:05:43–0:05:51), they demonstrate
20 retaliatory intent and agency policy (*Monell*), establishing no genuine dispute of material fact
21 and entitling Plaintiff to judgment as a matter of law.

25 **Qualified Immunity Defeat**

1 Deputy Palamar's conduct contravenes clearly established rights under *Pearson v. Callahan*, 555
2 U.S. 223 (2009):

3

4 • **Violation:** Recording retaliation (*Fordyce, Glik, Irizarry, Nieves, Umbehr*), seizure
5 (*Soldal*), due process (*Mathews, Parratt*)).

6 • **Clearly Established:** Rights were well-defined in 2022 (*Fordyce* 1995, *Soldal* 1992,
7 *Umbehr* 1996).

8

9 The tow (0:01:04) and threats (0:01:20) show objective unreasonableness (*Kingsley v.*
10 *Hendrickson*, 576 U.S. 389, 2015), not negligence. "Safety" or "need" defenses fail against
11 *Soldal*'s warrant requirement, *Mathews*'s notice mandate, and *Nieves*'s retaliation bar (*Harlow v.*
12 *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 1982).

13

14

15

16 **Authentication**

17

18 Per Fed. R. Evid. 901, I, Drew J. Ribar, declare under penalty of perjury this footage accurately
19 depicts Deputy Sean Palamar's tow arrangement and discussion on August 30, 2022.

20

21 **Dated: March 27, 2025**

22

23 **/s/ Drew J. Ribar**

24 **Drew J. Ribar**

25 3480 Pershing Ln, Washoe Valley, NV 89704

26 Tel: (775) 223-7899

27 Email: Const2Audit@gmail.com

28 PLEADING TITLE - 4